

OUT OF SIGHT, OUT OF MIND: MEDICAL MARIJUANA IN SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY

SUMMARY

Medical marijuana is legal in California, but regulation of the dispensing of medical marijuana in San Luis Obispo County is subjective and inconsistent. A county ordinance governing medical marijuana brick and mortar dispensaries has been approved, but the County Board of Supervisors has repeatedly rejected the applications of such dispensaries. Moreover, an unknown number of unregulated medical marijuana delivery services are active in both the cities and the unincorporated areas of the county. These delivery services have created a “gray” market that local government is ignoring.

As a result, safe access for those legally authorized for medical marijuana use is not ensured, thereby placing the safety of the community at risk. Well-defined governmental regulation and oversight would support healthcare providers and optimize patient safety and well-being by ensuring safe access to medical marijuana for those legally authorized, while limiting its diversion to recreational use.

INTRODUCTION

This Grand Jury report is intended to be an overview of how medical marijuana is regulated within the boundaries of our county. It analyzes the confusing, conflicting, and ineffective laws, policies, and practices regarding the dispensing of medical marijuana that so frustrate local jurisdictions in California. The U.S. Attorneys’ recent emphasis on enforcement of federal law in California adds another layer of confusion. The fact that federal law does not consider marijuana medically beneficial further complicates the situation. Ultimately, the courts may resolve these issues.

The findings presented in this report are meant to inform; the recommendations are meant to suggest that local governments have the ability to create order amid the current chaos through regulation and oversight. Local regulation and oversight could make medical marijuana at the local level safer for those who are legally authorized to use it and less available to those who abuse it.

Finally, this report is not to be construed as advocating the use of marijuana in any form.

AUTHORITY

Section 925 of the California Penal Code provides statutory authority for Grand Jury reports.

ORIGIN

The widely reported abuses to the intent of Proposition 215 - The Compassionate Use Act of 1996 - and SB 420 - The Medical Marijuana Program Act - created a perceived need for the Grand Jury to review the situation within San Luis Obispo County.

METHOD

The Grand Jury's inquiry included:

1. Review of Proposition 215 and SB 420
2. Interview with San Luis Obispo County Sheriff's Administration
3. Interviews with County Health Department staff
4. Interviews with local physicians familiar with the medical marijuana authorization process and related issues
5. Interviews with local medical marijuana delivery service collective managers/owners
6. Interview with an owner of a brick and mortar medical marijuana collective dispensary in another California county
7. Interview with County Building and Planning Department staff
8. A survey of city managers within the county

9. Review of city municipal codes relevant to medical marijuana
10. Interview with County Drug and Alcohol Services staff
11. Review of a sampling of hydroponics and “smoke shop” retail venues
12. Review of current research and literature concerning medical marijuana
13. Review of federal statutes
14. Review of medical marijuana policies in Mendocino County, Colorado, and Canada

NARRATIVE

In 1996, over 55% of California voters passed Proposition 215, legalizing the medical use of marijuana. Proposition 215 states that its purposes are:

- “To ensure that seriously ill Californians have the right to obtain and use marijuana for medical purposes where that medical use is deemed appropriate and has been recommended by a California licensed physician who has determined that a person’s health would benefit from the use of marijuana...
- “To ensure that patients and their primary caregivers who obtain and use marijuana for medical purposes upon the recommendation of a California licensed physician are not subject to criminal prosecution or sanction.” (see *Online Sources* in Appendix A)

In addition, Proposition 215 decriminalizes the possession and cultivation of marijuana by seriously ill individuals or their primary caregivers upon a California-licensed physician’s recommendation for approval. The law stipulates that to receive medical marijuana a patient must see a doctor and receive an authorization (not a prescription).

On January 1, 2004, the California legislature enacted SB 420 to clarify Proposition 215. It states that a patient’s medical records must contain written documentation by the attending physician that the patient has been diagnosed with a serious medical condition and that the medicinal use of cannabis is appropriate. (Cannabis is the scientific name for marijuana.) A “serious medical condition is defined to include: AIDS, anorexia, arthritis, cachexia, cancer, chronic pain, glaucoma, migraine, persistent muscle spasms (multiple sclerosis), seizures, severe nausea, and

any other chronic or persistent medical symptom that either substantially limits the ability of the person to conduct one or more major life activities or if not alleviated, may cause serious harm to the patient's safety or physical or mental health.”

Implementation of SB 420 calls for the attending physician to fulfill a number of requirements, including licensing, examinations, and diagnoses, documentation of condition, medical records, and medical release forms. Physicians who authorize medical marijuana for a serious disease may not recommend a specific medical marijuana dispensary and may not authorize a certain dosage.

Obtaining Medical Marijuana Authorization in San Luis Obispo County

The Grand Jury interviewed local physicians familiar with marijuana policies, including one who does not issue medical marijuana authorizations and two whose practices involve medical marijuana examinations and authorizations. There are some similarities among the physicians. All are licensed to practice medicine in the State of California. All agreed that the state law and county regulations are too vague, making it difficult to determine whether a physician is failing to provide an acceptable standard of care.

Those physicians granting medical marijuana authorizations differ widely in how they evaluate patients. Not all of these physicians are members of recognized professional organizations, however, The physicians interviewed are familiar with the guidelines published by the California Medical Association (CMA), and the two physicians who do issue authorizations claim that they are following those guidelines, as well as all related laws. They sign a medical marijuana authorization that states the patient has a “serious disease” and is authorized to legally possess marijuana. These two physicians do not recommend a specific medical marijuana dispensary and do not authorize a certain dosage. Both of these physicians believe that medical marijuana can treat anxiety, insomnia, chronic pain, depression, panic attacks, and migraines.

The Role of the County Health Department

The language of SB 420 imposed “various duties upon county health departments relating to the issuance of identification cards, creating a state mandated local program.” It became mandatory that all counties participate in a new identification card (ID) program by:

- providing applications upon request to individuals seeking to join the identification card program
- processing completed applications
- maintaining certain records
- following state implementation protocols, and
- issuing Department of Public Health (DPH) ID cards to approved applicants or their designated primary caregivers

For the County Health Department, the medical marijuana ID program is strictly administrative. The Vital Records staff verifies identity, medical authorizations, and the authorizing physician’s California medical license. Staff also takes the ID card photo, requests the ID card from Sacramento, processes fees, and maintains a record of applications. There is no provision for checking criminal records

The fee is \$135 of which half goes to the state and half to the county. There is a reduced fee of \$67.50 for Medi-Cal recipients. The card expires after one year and is renewable with annual payment of the fee.

The primary intent of the California Medical Marijuana ID Card is to provide information to law enforcement officers who may want to verify the identity and authorization of a medical marijuana patient. It is not mandatory for the patient to obtain an ID card, however. By law, an authorization by a California-licensed physician is all that is required for a patient to buy or possess medical marijuana.

Since 2006, the county has issued 408 cards. The highest yearly total issued was 128 in 2010; in 2011, the count decreased to 48. County staff could not attribute the drop to anything in

particular, except that patients may not have wanted to pay the fee because the card is not mandatory. The county has never denied an application for an ID card.

Currently, the Health Department does not concern itself with matters of public health in regard to medical marijuana. The contaminants, pesticide content, and potency of the marijuana distributed to authorized citizens of the county are not addressed. Edible medical marijuana products are not monitored or regulated by the county health agencies (nor by the state) as are other commercially distributed edible products. The Director of the San Luis Obispo County Health Agency stated in an interview that the County Health Department would “probably” have jurisdiction over marijuana edibles. The Department is researching the issue.

Appropriate testing and regulating of medical marijuana, including edibles, by the county or incorporated cities would undoubtedly be expensive, but not necessarily a non-recoverable expense. For example, the City of Oakland taxes medical marijuana. It reported that \$1.4 million in business taxes was collected in 2011 from medical marijuana dispensaries, nearly three percent of all business taxes collected in the city that year.

City and County Ordinances

Each incorporated city in the county has an ordinance prohibiting medical marijuana dispensaries.

On February 6, 2007, the County Board of Supervisors approved an ordinance requiring a Minor Use Permit for medical marijuana dispensaries. It was authored by County Building and Planning staff and centered on the following design and operational standards:

1. The location must be outside the central business district and a minimum of 1000 feet from any school, library, park or recreation area.
2. Limitation on use.
 - a. Hours of operation are limited to 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. seven days per week.
 - b. No person under the age of 18 permitted.
 - c. No retail sales of paraphernalia

- d. No cultivation permitted at or on dispensary property.
3. Staff/employees must be 21 years of age or older.
4. A security plan must be submitted.
5. A notice must be posted that persons under the age of 18 are not allowed.
6. A notice must be posted that consumption of medical marijuana is prohibited in the vicinity of the dispensary.
7. The Sheriff's Department shall be notified of the dispensary name, location and contact information.

The process begins with an application to the County Building and Planning Department. County Building and Planning staff produces a report with a recommendation to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission convenes a public hearing and may approve or disapprove the application for a Minor Use Permit. The Planning Commission may also recommend conditions and move the Conditional Use Permit to the Board of Supervisors for approval. The public may appeal the Planning Commission's decision to the Board of Supervisors.

There have been three applications for collective dispensaries since the county ordinance was passed. The first two applications were denied. The last application to go before the Planning Commission was heard on November 3, 2011. Staff recommended denial of the application, but the Planning Commission granted a Conditional Use Permit. The approval was appealed to the Board of Supervisors and the Board upheld the appeal, thereby denying the application, on March 6, 2012.

Brick and Mortar Dispensaries/Collectives

"Collective" is the legal term for a dispensary. The purpose of these dispensaries/collectives is to provide safe and secure access to medical marijuana. In a collective, marijuana received from growers and manufactured edibles may be tested for contaminants (including pesticides) and THC levels. Edibles can also be labeled for potency by the manufacturer.

On January 18, 2012 the California Supreme Court voted unanimously to review how cities and counties regulate medical marijuana dispensaries based on four medical marijuana cases:

- *Pack v. City of Long Beach* involves a Court of Appeal ruling that Long Beach's medical marijuana dispensary ordinance was pre-empted by the federal Controlled Substances Act.
- *City of Riverside v. Inland Patient's Health & Wellness Center, Inc.* and *People v. G3 Holistic* concern Court of Appeal decisions upholding ordinances that banned medical marijuana dispensaries.
- *Traudt v. City of Dana Point* involves a Court of Appeals decision concerning an individual's standing to bring a lawsuit alleging a violation of state law with respect to a medical marijuana collective.¹

Mobile Delivery Collectives

Proposition 215 did not stipulate that all collective operations emanate from a “brick and mortar” collective, thereby leaving room for mobile delivery collectives. Mobile delivery collectives register medical marijuana patients as members and deliver medical marijuana to the members, usually at home. The members' obligation to the collective is the cash they contribute in exchange for the medical marijuana. Several of these collectives advertise in San Luis Obispo County, in the local media and online.

The Grand Jury heard testimony that as many as 40 delivery services currently operate within the incorporated and unincorporated areas of the county. Medical marijuana mobile delivery collectives are more difficult to regulate because they operate in multiple jurisdictions, which adds to law enforcement's challenges.

Cities within San Luis Obispo County and the county itself have ordinances prohibiting or regulating brick and mortar medical marijuana dispensaries, but there are no regulations

¹League of California Cities. “California Supreme Court Grants Review of Four Medical Marijuana Cases,” January 20, 2012. www.cacities.org/Top/News/News-Articles/2012/January.

affecting medical marijuana mobile delivery collectives, with one exception. The city of Atascadero has approved an ordinance prohibiting mobile delivery collectives.

The lack of ordinances and regulations governing mobile delivery collectives at the local level has led to a chaotic situation. The Attorney General of California has issued General Guidelines regarding medical marijuana, but there are no local regulations to which mobile delivery collectives must adhere. As a result, law enforcement officials have few tools to evaluate whether mobile delivery collectives are operating legitimately.

Some collectives make a serious attempt to comply with Proposition 215 and SB 420, and the Attorney General Guidelines regarding medical marijuana; others pay little or no attention. The minimum age required to become a member of the collective varies; some allow members as young as 18, others have a minimum age of 21. Some collectives keep close records of their members and amounts disbursed, and verify physician authorizations for medical marijuana; others do not. A few collectives track medical marijuana from grower to collective to delivery driver, and to the collective member, and even weigh it at each stage, to ensure that there is no loss; others do not. Some collectives obtain local business licenses; most do not.

Although medical marijuana is authorized by physicians to treat certain conditions, it is not a prescription drug and is, therefore, subject to tax. Not all mobile delivery services, however, collect and pay sales taxes.

Finally, mobile delivery services conduct no testing of the product they sell. As a result, the quality of medical marijuana delivered can vary widely.

All city managers were asked if all businesses in their jurisdiction needed a business license. All answered in the affirmative, with Atascadero requiring a business tax. A search of the advertised delivery services in city records showed very few with business licenses. All city managers and Cal Poly law enforcement were asked how many medical marijuana delivery services operated within their jurisdiction. All answered none to their knowledge.

Local governments are simply not aware of the number of medical marijuana mobile collective delivery services operating in their jurisdictions and make no attempt to regulate these businesses. It is possible, however, for the county and the cities to take steps to require business licenses and fees for mobile delivery services. Additional revenue could then be generated for the county and the cities.

All the mobile collective delivery service managers interviewed by the Grand Jury operate within incorporated and unincorporated areas of the county, and one operates in a tri-county area. Membership agreements, recordkeeping and verification of physician authorizations were consistent for these collectives. Possession of a Sellers Permit and a Business License, as specified in the Attorney General Guidelines, however, was not consistent.

One interviewee stated that the local business environment actually encouraged creation of a growing “gray” or “black market” by forcing reputable mobile collective delivery services that attempt to comply with legal mandates out of business. The “grays and blacks” do not keep records or pay sales tax, thereby undercutting reputable mobile collective delivery services in pricing.

All of the managers interviewed agreed that testing for quality and potency would be appropriate and should be required. However, additional costs for testing would require higher prices that would likely drive their clients to the black market competition.

The Biggest Challenge: Enforcing the Law

California law enforcement agencies face a challenge in interpreting Proposition 215 for enforcement purposes. The law lacks clarity for agencies that are required to operate within “the letter of the law.” Initially, the Attorney General issued guidelines that proved helpful; over time, however, with legal challenges and various suggested interpretations, it has become increasingly difficult to separate the legal from the illegal.

For example, in December 2010, a San Luis Obispo County Narcotics Task Force operation resulted in the arrest of twelve local medical marijuana collective delivery service providers. This operation involved an undercover officer posing as a medical marijuana patient.

Issues emerged at the trial as a result of the investigation and interpretation of the law. There was a lack of consistency in the municipal requirement of a business license, seller's permit or incorporation as a California Mutual Benefit Non-Profit operation.

One of the county's high-ranking law enforcement officers approached the Governor (who in his former position as Attorney General formulated the Proposition 215 Guidelines) with the question, "What makes a 'collective' illegal?" The answer was "profits" but a definitive definition of "profit" in regard to collectives has not been provided by the state.

In 2011, the California Attorney General formally asked the legislature to clarify state law to bring "certainty and consistency" to law enforcement, the medical marijuana collectives and authorized patients. Areas to be addressed include: defining the contours of the right to collective and cooperative cultivation; what constitutes a "dispensary;" a definition of non-profit operation as it applies to providers; and, requirements for edible medical marijuana products.

At present, local governments that apply conflicting rules and regulations largely govern medical marijuana. A proposed November 2012 initiative would establish a medical marijuana enforcement bureau in the California Department of Consumer Affairs. This could be a step forward in assisting peace officers to perform their duties more efficiently and effectively.

Law enforcement officials in the county have linked two homicides and a dozen home invasions to medical marijuana. Some medical marijuana is diverted to non-patients, young people, and the black market. For public safety, it is important that law enforcement have guidelines to help determine who is a legal provider or user of medical marijuana.

CONCLUSION

Accurate medical marijuana usage estimates cannot be made due to the lack of regulatory reporting. County and most municipal officials are either uninformed or they ignore the mobile collective delivery services.

San Luis Obispo County has an ordinance allowing brick and mortar medical marijuana dispensaries, but the Board of Supervisors has denied all applications to date. Incorporated cities have ordinances that ban brick and mortar collectives, but most have no ordinance governing mobile delivery services in their communities, similar to the county. Unregulated mobile collective delivery services driving through our county and its communities with unknown sums of money and large quantities of medical marijuana invite potentially tragic consequences.

Safe access for authorized medical marijuana patients is the issue, and regulation is the key. Codes and ordinances could place specific, reviewable, measurable, and enforceable conditions on dispensaries, as well as delivery services.

If governing bodies in the county would acknowledge these issues and act to mitigate them, authorized patients might then have safe access to medical marijuana and local governments could receive business license revenue. Also, law enforcement would have the means to distinguish between legitimate, state-authorized operations and those that are illegitimate, in other words, distinguish between “the good guys” and “the bad guys.”

FINDINGS

Finding 1: San Luis Obispo County has an ordinance allowing brick and mortar medical marijuana collectives, but the Board of Supervisors has rejected all applications to date.

Finding 2: Each incorporated city in the county has an ordinance prohibiting brick and mortar medical marijuana collectives within its city limits.

Finding 3: The county and incorporated cities in the county have not adopted an ordinance regarding medical marijuana mobile collective delivery services operating within their jurisdictions, with the exception of Atascadero.

Finding 4: Business licenses are required for all businesses operating in the incorporated and unincorporated areas of the county.

Finding 5: Many medical marijuana mobile collective delivery services operate in the incorporated and unincorporated areas of the county without a business license.

Finding 6: There is currently no way to determine the exact number of medical marijuana mobile collective delivery services operating in the incorporated and unincorporated areas of the county or on the Cal Poly campus.

Finding 7: There is no protocol for medical marijuana mobile collective delivery service recordkeeping.

Finding 8: Medical marijuana, including edibles, is not regulated by the County Health Department.

Finding 9: Home invasions and homicides have resulted from medical marijuana being present or grown in homes.

Finding 10: The County Health Department is designated to administer the medical marijuana ID program and it satisfies the requirements set forth in Proposition 215 and SB 420.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: The County Board of Supervisors should convene a committee comprised of the County Sheriff, County Building and Planning staff, local public health officials, the County Tax Collector, the County Planning Commission, brick and mortar medical marijuana collective and mobile collective delivery service managers, medical marijuana physician providers, and community representatives. The purpose of the committee should be to develop a fair and viable local ordinance for brick and mortar medical marijuana collectives that provide authorized patients with safe access to contaminant-free medical marijuana in accordance with California law.

Recommendation 2: The county and incorporated cities in the county should develop an ordinance regarding medical marijuana mobile collective delivery services within their respective jurisdictions.

Recommendation 3: By code or ordinance, the county and each incorporated city in the county should require medical marijuana mobile collective delivery services operating within their jurisdiction to possess a business license and seller's permit.

Recommendation 4: Using business license records, seller's permits and sales taxes, the county and each incorporated city in the county should compile a list of medical marijuana mobile collective delivery services operating within their jurisdictions.

Recommendation 5: By code or ordinance, the county and each incorporated city in the county should require medical marijuana collectives and mobile collective delivery services to keep current records.

Recommendation 6: The County Health Department should consider establishing standards for edible medical marijuana sold in the county.

REQUIRED RESPONSES

The San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors is required to respond to **Findings** 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and **Recommendations** 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. The responses shall be submitted to the Presiding Judge of the San Luis Obispo County Superior Court by **September 24, 2012**. Please provide a paper copy and an electronic version of all responses to the Grand Jury as well.

The City of Arroyo Grande is required to respond to **Findings** 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and **Recommendations** 2, 3, 4, and 5. The responses shall be submitted to the Presiding Judge of the San Luis Obispo County Superior Court by **September 24, 2012**. Please provide a paper copy and an electronic version of all responses to the Grand Jury as well.

The City of Atascadero is required to respond to **Findings**, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and **Recommendations** 3, 4, and 5. The responses shall be submitted to the Presiding Judge of the San Luis Obispo County Superior Court by **September 24, 2012**. Please provide a paper copy and an electronic version of all responses to the Grand Jury as well.

The City of Grover Beach is required to respond to **Findings** 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and **Recommendations** 2, 3, 4, and 5. The responses shall be submitted to the Presiding Judge of the San Luis Obispo County Superior Court by **September 24, 2012**. Please provide a paper copy and an electronic version of all responses to the Grand Jury as well.

The City of Morro Bay is required to respond to **Findings** 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and **Recommendations** 2, 3, 4, and 5. The responses shall be submitted to the Presiding Judge of the San Luis Obispo County Superior Court by **September 24, 2012**. Please provide a paper copy and an electronic version of all responses to the Grand Jury as well.

The City of Paso Robles is required to respond to **Findings** 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and **Recommendations** 2, 3, 4, and 5. The responses shall be submitted to the Presiding Judge of the San Luis Obispo County Superior Court by **September 24, 2012**. Please provide a paper copy and an electronic version of all responses to the Grand Jury as well.

The City of Pismo Beach is required to respond to **Findings** 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and **Recommendations** 2, 3, 4, and 5. The responses shall be submitted to the Presiding Judge of the San Luis Obispo County Superior Court by **September 24, 2012**. Please provide a paper copy and an electronic version of all responses to the Grand Jury as well.

The City of San Luis Obispo is required to respond to **Findings** 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and **Recommendations** 2, 3, 4, and 5. The responses shall be submitted to the Presiding Judge of the San Luis Obispo County Superior Court by **September 24, 2012**. Please provide a paper copy and an electronic version of all responses to the Grand Jury as well.

The San Luis Obispo County Health Department is required to respond to **Findings** 8 and 10, and **Recommendation** 6. The responses shall be submitted to the Presiding Judge of the San Luis Obispo County Superior Court by **August 27, 2012**. Please provide a paper copy and an electronic version of all responses to the Grand Jury as well. The mailing addresses for delivery are:

Presiding Judge	Grand Jury
Presiding Judge Barry T. LaBarbera Superior Court of California 1050 Monterey Street San Luis Obispo, CA 93408	San Luis Obispo County Grand Jury P.O. Box 4910 San Luis Obispo, CA 93402

The e-mail address for the Grand Jury is: GrandJury@co.slo.ca.us

APPENDIX A

ONLINE SOURCES*

CA Attorney General Guidelines:

www.ag.ca.gov/cms_attachments/press/pdfs/n1601_medicalmarijuanaguidelines.pdf

Medical Marijuana Identification Card Program:

www.slocounty.ca.gov/health/publichealth/mmic_htm

Driving Miss Mary Jane, David Freed, January/February 2012:

www.Miller-Mcune.com

Medical Marijuana Raid In SLO County Raises Questions:

www.sanluisobispo.com/2011/01/08/1436280/medical-marijuana-raid.html

Proposition 215, Health & Safety Code 11362.5:

www.cannorml.org/laws/hsc11362_5.html

Senate Bill 420, Health and Safety Code 11362.7:

www.potdoc.com/bill_sb_420.html

Testing for Contaminants and Potency in Medical Marijuana:

www.Halent.com

Marijuana Addiction and Medical Marijuana Patients:

www.cannabisdoctorsnetwork.com/marijuana-addiction-symptoms.php

www.cmanet.org/medicalmarijuana

www.mbc.ca.gov/media/releases_2004_05_13_marijuana.html

<http://sanluisobispo.areaconnect.com/doctors>

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/California_proposition_15_\(1996\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/California_proposition_15_(1996))

CA Attorney General's Letter to Lawmakers, December 21, 2011:

www.californiaprogressreport.com/site/attorney-general-issues-letter-lawmakers-medical-marijuana

Regulation of Medical Marijuana Dispensaries to be considered by the California Supreme Court:
www.sanluisobispo.com/2012/01/19/1913641/marijuana-dispensaries-california-html#storylink=cpy

Delivery Services Map:

www.californiawatch.org/public-safety/map-medical-marijuana-delivery-services-california

Delivery Services by Zip:

www.weedmaps.com

Marijuana Edibles:

www.fhwcc.org/edibles/

Medical Marijuana: Inhalation vs. Edibles:

www.marijuanamedicine.com/2009/06/medical-marijuana-inhalation-vs-edibles-why-is-it-so-different/

Cannabis Doctors Network:

www.cannabisdoctorsnetwork.com/marijuana-addiction-symptoms.php

Canada:

www.hc-sc.gc.ca/dhp-mps/marihuana/about-apropos/faq-eng.php

Colorado:

www.cdphe.state.co.us/hs/medicalmarijuana

<http://reason.com/blog/2012/03/05/us-attorney-in-colorado-says-all-state-1>

Mendocino County:

www.mendocinosheriff.com

www.mendocinocountry.com/independent/1cannabis/2policy/9.31passes.html

*To be useful, these links may best be copied and pasted into a browser